

Electromagnetic Pulsar Spindown

Ioannis Contopoulos

Research Center for Astronomy, Academy of Athens, 4 Soranou Efessiou Str., Athens 11527, Greece
 e-mail: icontop@academyofathens.gr

Abstract. We evaluate the result of the recent pioneering numerical simulations in Spitkovsky 2006 on the spindown of an oblique relativistic magnetic dipole rotator. Our discussion is based on our experience from two idealized cases, that of an aligned dipole rotator, and that of an oblique split-monopole rotator. We conclude that the issue of electromagnetic pulsar spindown may not have been resolved yet.

1. Introduction

We believe that pulsars are spinning down magnetized neutron stars with non-aligned rotation and magnetic axes (oblique rotators). We also believe that pulsars lose rotational energy through electromagnetic torques due to the establishment of large scale electric currents in their magnetospheres. Unfortunately, an exact expression for the electromagnetic (Poynting) flux energy loss L as a function of the magnetic inclination angle θ remains still elusive. Most people are content with the approximation that pulsars spin down at the same rate as 90° vacuum dipole rotators, namely that

$$L(\theta) \approx L_{\text{vac}}(90^\circ) \equiv \frac{B^2 r^6 \Omega^4}{6c^3}, \quad (1)$$

where, B , r , Ω are the polar value of the magnetic field, the radius of the neutron star, and the star’s angular velocity respectively. Knowing the exact electromagnetic energy loss rate, observations of the pulse period P and period derivative $\dot{P}$ would allow us to accurately infer the value of B . Moreover, the dependence of L on the magnetic inclination angle θ has very important implications for the evolution and distribution of pulsars in the $P-\dot{P}$ diagram (Contopoulos & Spitkovsky 2006).

In a real pulsar, the vacuum approximation leading to eq. 1 is obviously not valid, because without the establishment of magnetospheric electric currents a magnetic rotator cannot generate pulses. The study of the oblique relativistic magnetic rotator is, therefore, a formidable MHD problem as described clearly in Spitkovsky 2006: “Modeling of the structure of the highly magnetized magne-

tospheres of neutron stars requires solving for the self-consistent behavior of plasma in strong fields, where field energy can dominate the energy of the plasma. This is difficult to do with the standard numerical methods of MHD which are forced to evolve plasma inertial terms even when they are small compared to the field terms. In these cases it is possible to reformulate the problem and instead of solving for the plasma dynamics in strong fields, solve for the dynamic of fields in the presence of conducting plasma. This is the approach of force-free electrodynamics”. In his recent pioneering work, Spitkovsky 2006 managed to evolve numerically an oblique dipolar magnetosphere for about 1.2 turns of the star, and claimed that the solution very quickly settles to a constant electromagnetic energy flux which depends on the magnetic inclination angle as

$$L_{\text{Spitkovsky}}(\theta) = \frac{B^2 r^6 \Omega^4}{4c^3} (1 + \sin^2 \theta). \quad (2)$$

As we said, this result is very important, and while waiting for independent numerical confirmation, we thought that we should be able to reproduce its main elements from first principles. We will, therefore, consider two idealized cases where we know the electromagnetic energy loss rate analytically.

2. The axisymmetric magnetic dipole rotator

Contopoulos, Kazanas & Fendt 1999 (hereafter CKF) first obtained the structure of the axisymmetric pulsar magnetosphere with a dipole stellar magnetic field. They showed that, at large distances from the central star, the asymptotic structure is that of a magnetic split monopole, i.e. a certain amount of initially dipolar magnetic flux

$$\Psi_{\text{open}} = 1.23 \frac{\pi B r^3 \Omega}{c} \quad (3)$$

stretches out radially to infinity in one hemisphere, and returns to the star in the other hemisphere. Electromagnetic spindown is due to the establishment of a poloidal electric current distribution

$$I(\Psi) \sim -\frac{\Omega \Psi}{4\pi} \left(2 - \frac{\Psi}{\Psi_{\text{open}}} \right) \quad (4)$$

which flows to large distances along open field lines and returns to the star through an equatorial current sheet that joins at the light cylinder with the separatrix between open and closed field lines. CKF obtained a first approximation for Ψ_{open} and $I(\Psi)$ self consistently, by requiring that the solution be continuous and smooth at the light cylinder. The CKF solution has since been confirmed, improved and generalized in Gruzinov 2005a, Contopoulos 2005, Timokhin 2005, Komissarov 2005, McKinney 2005 and Spitkovsky 2006.

The electromagnetic spindown luminosity is thus obtained as

$$L_{\text{CKF}} = \frac{\Omega}{\pi c} \int_{\Psi=0}^{\Psi_{\text{open}}} I(\Psi) d\Psi \approx \frac{B^2 r^6 \Omega^4}{4c^3} \approx \frac{\Omega^2}{6\pi^2 c} \Psi_{\text{open}}^2 \quad (5)$$

(e.g. Beskin 1997). This result may be easily understood as follows. As we said, the structure of the axisymmetric dipole rotator magnetosphere approaches asymptotically that of an axisymmetric split-monopole (Michel 1991), and therefore, the spindown luminosity depends only on the amount of open field lines Ψ_{open} .

3. The oblique magnetic split-monopole rotator

Bogovalov 1999 showed that eq. 5 is also valid for an oblique split-monopole rotator. As long as current sheet discontinuities are present to guarantee magnetic flux conservation, properties of cold MHD plasma flows do not depend on the direction of the magnetic field. In fact, all properties obtained for the axisymmetric split-monopole rotator are the same for the oblique rotator as well. In particular, rotational losses of the oblique split-monopole rotator are independent of the inclination angle. They depend only on the square of the amount of open field lines Ψ_{open}^2 (obviously, the sign of Ψ_{open} is irrelevant).

We may now derive an important conclusion about the oblique dipole rotator which too, as we argued, becomes asymptotically split-monopole-like: rotational losses of the oblique rotator depend indirectly on the inclination angle only through the amount of open field lines Ψ_{open} as

$$L_{\text{estimate}}(\theta) \approx \frac{\Omega^2}{6\pi^2 c} \Psi_{\text{open}}^2(\theta) . \quad (6)$$

4. The oblique magnetic dipole rotator

We have now come full circle. We may estimate the electromagnetic spindown luminosity of an oblique rotator through an estimate of the amount of open magnetic flux as a function of the inclination angle $\Psi_{\text{open}}(\theta)$. A crude estimate may be obtained if we calculate the amount of magnetic flux that crosses the light cylinder distance in the case of an inclined magnetostatic dipole at the origin, and rescale our result by the CKF factor 1.23 (note that Gruzinov 2005b used a similar argument in his estimate

of the spindown luminosity). This calculation yields

$$\Psi_{\text{open}}(\theta) \sim 1.23 \frac{\pi B r^3 \Omega}{c} (1 - 0.2 \sin^2 \theta) , \quad (7)$$

which results in the following crude estimate of the spindown luminosity,

$$L_{\text{estimate}}(\theta) \sim \frac{B^2 r^6 \Omega^4}{4c^3} (1 - 0.4 \sin^2 \theta) . \quad (8)$$

In particular, we see that $L(90^\circ) < L(0^\circ)$, contrary to what both Gruzinov 2005b and Spitkovsky 2006 obtain. Note that Spitkovsky's numerical simulation result agrees well with Gruzinov's estimate, and yet the latter mentions that he is not even sure about the sign of the θ term that he obtains.

We do not claim here that our above estimate has the same weight as the result of a detailed numerical simulation. Interestingly enough, the recent discovery of an “on/off” pulsar (Kramer *et al.* 2006) offers some further insight from observations. The pulsar Kramer *et al.* discovered is thought to be a 90° oblique rotator with two states of emission. During the “off” state, no pulses are seen, and the neutron star is indirectly inferred to spin down at a certain rate L_{off} . During the “on” state, the pulsar is observed to spin down at a rate $L_{\text{on}} = 1.5 L_{\text{off}}$. It is very tempting to associate the “off” state with a vacuum state where the spindown rate is analytically known (eq. 1). The observations then imply that

$$L(90^\circ) = L_{\text{on}} = \frac{3}{2} L_{\text{vac}}(90^\circ) \equiv L_{\text{CKF}} \equiv L(0^\circ) . \quad (9)$$

In other words, a 90° oblique MHD rotator is observed to spin down at the same rate as an aligned rotator. This result is more consistent with our crude estimate in eq. 8 than with eq. 2.

We thus conclude that the discrepancy between the two estimates is an indication that the issue of electromagnetic pulsar spindown may not have been resolved yet, and that further investigation is needed, both analytical and numerical.

References

- Beskin, V. S. 1997, *Physics-Uspekhi*, 40, 659
- Bogovalov, S. 1999, *A&A*, 349, 1017
- Contopoulos, I., Kazanas, D. & Fendt, C. 1999, *ApJ*, 511, 351 (CKF)
- Contopoulos, I. 2005, *A&A*, 442, 579
- Contopoulos, I. & Spitkovsky, A. 2006, *ApJ*, 643, 1139
- Gruzinov, A. 2005a, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 94, 021101
- Gruzinov, A. 2005b, *astro-ph/0502554*
- McKinney, J. C. 2006, *MNRAS*, 368, L30
- Michel, F. C. 1991, *Theory of Neutron Star Magnetospheres* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press)
- Komissarov, S. S. 2006, *MNRAS*, 367, 19
- Kramer *et al.* 2006, *Science*, 312, 549
- Spitkovsky, A. 2006, *ApJ*, in press (*astro-ph/0603147*)
- Timokhin, A. N., 2006, *MNRAS*, 368, 1055